

Coulthard, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*.

London: Longman.

Crystal, D. (1985) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Basil Blackwell.

Heritage, J. (1984) "A Chance of State Token and Aspects of It's

Sequential Placement". in

Atkinson, J. and Heritage, J. (eds.) *Structures of Social Actions*

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinson, L. (1983) *Pragmatics*.

Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. (1970)

Semantics Vol.1. Cambridge: Cambridge University

Press

McCarthy, M. (1991) *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*.

Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press.

Mey, J.L. (1993) *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nofsinger, R. (1991) *Everyday Conversation*. London: SAGE

Publication Ltd.

Pomerantz, A. (1984) "Purauing a Response". In

Atkinson, J. and

Heritage, J. (eds.)

Structures of Social

Actions. Cambridge:

Cambridge University

Press.

Renkema, J. (1993) *Discourse*

Studies: An Introductory

Textbook.

Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Schegloff, E. (1968). "Sequencing in Conversational Opening" In *American*

Anthropologist 70. Vol. 2. PP.343-414.

Schegloff, E. and Sacks, H. (1973) *Opening Up Closings*. In

semiotica 8. 289-327.

Schiffrin, D. (1987) *Discourse Markers*. New York: Cambridge

University Press

Stenstrom, A. (1994) *An*

Introduction to Spoken

Interaction. London:

Longman.

Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*.

Oxford: Oxford University Press.

ملخص البحث:

إن الكثير من الكلام في أية محادثة يأخذ برقاب بعض، حتى يكون وحدة متماسكة، ومترابطة، والكثير منه يكون موجهاً ومقصوداً في جميع أدوار المحادثة، وعليه يجب أن تكون الأجوبة على قدر كبير من التناسب والانتظام، كالذي يحصل في الاعتذار على سبيل المثال. وإن هذا التناسب في أدوار المحادثة يمكن أن يعد أساسياً ومهماً جداً في إدارة المحادثة بصورة براغماتية أو في تحليلها تحليلاً لغوياً.

arrogant to hold others at arm's length.

In these verses, Moses (the first participant) talked with another participant (the Samiri, the second one) asked him about his matter and what he did:

قَالَ فَمَا خَطْبُكَ يَا سَامِرِيُّ

According to this question, he answered him positively to make, as a whole an adjacency pair of Question / Answer, it is a preferred second turn according to preference system, and it is unmarked.

4. Conclusions

Adjacency pairs are functionally important in organizing face-to-face conversation. They occupy a position in which the participants should contribute what are intended in those situations, particularly, adjacency pairs in the religions texts.

First of all, the turns of such texts are somehow complex because of the authority of their participants that they are of high dignity and position. The main character (participant) in these texts is Allah (جل جلاله), the other participants can be classified into Messengers, Prophets, Angles, dignified persons, common persons (people), ... and so forth.

Concerning the analysis of adjacency pair, most of the turns can be classified under the group of order, requests which are in most cases followed by an acceptance. That is so because of the formal

relationship between the participants. Moreover, the second adjacent turn is the Question / Answer which is between the participants of different social statues. At the end of the sura, there was some sort of struggle between the participants (Pharaoh, Istralites, the magicians, and the like). This creates another adjacency pair which is Blame / Denial or Admission and Assesment / Agreement or Disagreement.

On the other hand, most the turns are described as unmarked, as far as the preference system is concerned. This can be related to the different social statues like Allah (جل جلاله) (superior) and (Moses and Aaron) (inferior), what is more, Moses and Pharaoh, Moses and the Israelites, Moses and his brother, Moses and the Samiri, the Samiri and the Israelites, and soon. There are almost dispreferred second turns when the participants are not similar in thinking and belief. As a whole, most the analyzed texts are of unmarked preferred second turns because of their specificity as between a superior and an inferior and because of the specific nature of such texts.

It is worthy mentioning, the text tends to show the lack of the insertion sequences between the turns, and also the lack of the non-vocal element such as eye-movement, body movement, gestures and the like.

References

Admission . It is dispreferred and marked.

قَالَ يَا هَارُونَ مَا مَنَعَكَ إِذْ رَأَيْتَهُمْ ضَلُّوا ۖ أَلا تَتَّبِعُنَّ
أَفَعَصَيْتَ أَمْرِي ۗ قَالَ يَا أَبْنِ أُمَّ لَا تَأْخُذْ بِلِحْيَتِي وَلَا بِرَأْسِي
إِنِّي خَشِيتُ أَنْ تَقُولَ فَرَّقْتَ بَيْنَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَلَمْ تَرْقُبْ
قَوْلِي ۖ (طه: ٩٢-٩٤)

These verses complete the narration of the story of Moses. When he came back, he was full of anger and grief. His speech to Aaron is one of rebuke, and he was also inclined to handle him roughly.

In turn, Aaron's reply was inconsistent. On the contrary, there was a dramatic aptness in the different points emphasized on each occasion. Aaron was referring by implication to his brother's wish to maintain unity among the people. Here the unity is the chief point to be emphasised.

Here the conversation turns to be with two different participants, Moses is the first participant and Aaron is the second one. It begins with a question (مَا مَنَعَكَ) functioning as a blame (الآتبعن), in turn, Aaron answered his brother or he denied his blame requesting him:

لَا تَأْخُذْ بِلِحْيَتِي وَلَا بِرَأْسِي

Then it is followed by a denial with a justification:

إِنِّي خَشِيتُ أَنْ تَقُولَ فَرَّقْتَ بَيْنَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَلَمْ تَرْقُبْ
قَوْلِي

It is an adjacency pair of Blame / denial kind, concerning preference system, it is a preferred second turn, concerning markedness, and it is unmarked.

قَالَ فَمَا خَطْبُكَ يَا سَامِرِيُّ ۖ قَالَ بَصُرْتُ بِمَا لَمْ يَبْصُرُوا بِهِ
فَقَبَضْتُ قَبْضَةً مِنْ أَثَرِ الرَّسُولِ فَنَبَذْتُهَا وَكَذَلِكَ سَوَّلَتْ لِي
نَفْسِي ۗ قَالَ فَاذْهَبْ فَإِنَّ لَكَ فِي الْحَيَاةِ أَنْ تَقُولَ لَا مِسَاسَ
وَإِنَّ لَكَ مَوْعِدًا لَنْ تُخْلَفَهُ وَانظُرْ إِلَى إِلَهِكَ الَّذِي ظَلْتَ عَلَيْهِ
عَاكِفًا لَنُحَرِّقَنَّهُ ثُمَّ لَنَنْسِفَنَّهُ فِي الْيَمِّ نَسْفًا ۖ

(طه: ٩٥-٩٧)

Moses now turned to the Samiri asking him about his matter. Samiri's reply in the second verse summed up his character in a few wonderful strokes of a character – painting. He maintained that he was a believer and he took a handful of dust of the footprint of the Messenger and threw it in the calf. He took upon himself to pretend that he had far more insight than anybody else: he saw what the vulgar crowd did not see. He saw something supernatural.

As a punishment for his sin, Moses ordered him to go and there would be nothing touchable in this life. Moses and his kind were to become social lepers, untouchables, and perhaps also sufficiently

and the promise of the people of Israel :

أَمْ أَرَدْتُمْ أَنْ يَجِلَّ عَلَيْكُمْ غَضَبٌ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ فَأَخْلَقْتُمْ مَوْعِدِي

They form one covenant, which was entered into through their leader Moses. Allah's promise was to protect them and lead them to Promised Land, and their promise was to obey Allah's Law and His Commandments.

The Israelites borrowed from the Egyptians jewels of silver and gold before they left – In this way, the Samiri was responsible for suggesting the making of the golden calf, but they could not disclaim responsibility for themselves; the burden of the sin is on him who commits it, and he cannot pretend that he was powerless to avoid it. The weight of the gold they carried could not be heavy even if one or two men carried it. At last, they melt it and cast it into the shape of a calf.

This pair can be represented by its two participants, Moses (the first participant), the Israelites (the second one). The first turn is a kind of blame, which could be followed by a denial or an admission. In this case, it is followed by a denial, a positive denial with a justification. As a whole, it is a preferred second turn, thus, it is unmarked.

فَأَخْرَجَ لَهُمْ عِجْلًا جَسَدًا لَهُ خُورٌ فَقَالُوا هَذَا إِلَهُكُمْ وَإِلَهُ
مُوسَىٰ فَنَسِيَ ۗ أَفَلَا يَرَوْنَ أَنَّهُ يُرْجَعُ إِلَيْهِمْ قَوْلًا وَلَا تَمْلِكُ لَهُمْ

ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا ۗ وَقَدْ قَالَ لَهُمْ هَارُونُ مِنْ قَبْلُ يَا قَوْمِ إِنَّمَا
فُتِنْتُمْ بِهِ وَإِنَّ رَبَّكُمُ الرَّحْمَنُ فَاتَّبِعُونِي وَأَطِيعُوا أَمْرِي ۗ قَالُوا
لَنْ نَبْرَحَ عَلَيْهِ عَاكِفِينَ حَتَّىٰ يَرْجِعَ إِلَيْنَا مُوسَىٰ ۗ

(طه: ٨٨-٩١)

Another stage of Moses' message can be represented throughout his struggle with the Samiri. After throwing the gold into fire, they went with the Samiri and they had forgotten Moses and His God, that he had been gone for so many days. He was searching for a god on the mount when his god is really here. This was spoken by the Samiri and his partisans, but the people as a whole accepted it, and it therefore became their speech. On the other side the Israelites (the rebels) had so little faith that they had given Moses up for lost, and never expected to see him again.

The second dimension is the conversation between Aaron, Moses' brother, (the first participant) and the Israelites (the second participant). Aaron blamed them on their following the Samiri:

يَا قَوْمِ إِنَّمَا فُتِنْتُمْ بِهِ وَإِنَّ رَبَّكُمُ الرَّحْمَنُ فَاتَّبِعُونِي وَأَطِيعُوا
أَمْرِي

On the other hand, they admitted what they had done saying :

قَالُوا لَنْ نَبْرَحَ عَلَيْهِ عَاكِفِينَ حَتَّىٰ يَرْجِعَ إِلَيْنَا مُوسَىٰ

According to this analysis, it is an adjacency pair of Blame /

In conclusion, it is an adjacency pair of Blame, assesment / Acceptance, accordingly, it is a preferred second turn, and it is unmarked.

وَمَا أَعْجَلَكَ عَنْ قَوْمِكَ يَا مُوسَى ۖ قَالَ هُمْ أَوْلَاءٌ عَلَيَّ
أَثْرِي وَعَجَلْتُ إِلَيْكَ رَبِّ لِتَرْضَى ۖ قَالَ فَإِنَّا قَدْ فَتَنَّا قَوْمَكَ
مِنْ بَعْدِكَ وَأَضَلَّهُمُ السَّامِرِيُّ ۖ (طه: ٨٣-٨٥)

These verses try to put the reader at the beginning of the Sura, in particular, the meeting between Moses and Allah.

This was when Moses was up on the Mount for forty days and forty nights. Moses had left the elders of Israel with Aaron behind him. While he was in a state of ecstatic honour on the Mount, his people were enacting strange scenes down below. They were tested and tried, and they failed in the trial. They made a golden image of a calf for worship.

The meeting begins with a question form

وَمَا أَعْجَلَكَ عَنْ قَوْمِكَ يَا مُوسَى

indicating that Moses had left his people alone. In turn, Moses answered positively saying:

هُمْ أَوْلَاءٌ عَلَيَّ أَثْرِي وَعَجَلْتُ إِلَيْكَ رَبِّ لِتَرْضَى

But Allah blamed Moses on that doing stating that they were deceived by Samiri. Samiri was subsequently not unknown among the Heberws is clear from the Old Testament. So, it is a person in the northeren partion of the divided

kingdom, who reigned about 903-896. B. C. and built a new city, Samaria, on a hill which he bought from shemer, the owner of the hill, for two talents of silver.

As the turns of that conversation are concened, it begins with a question which can be considered as blame from Allah (the first participant) to Moses (the second participant) who answered them that question positively. So, it is an adjacency pair of Question / Answer; it is a preferred second turn, accordingly, it is unmarked. What is noticed in that conversation is that Moses' answer is followed by a statement from Allah:

قَالَ فَإِنَّا قَدْ فَتَنَّا قَوْمَكَ مِنْ بَعْدِكَ وَأَضَلَّهُمُ

to begin another stage of that conversation to be turned between Moses and his people .

فَرَجَعَ مُوسَى إِلَى قَوْمِهِ غَضْبَانَ أَسِفًا قَالَ يَا قَوْمِ أَلَمْ يَعِدْكُمْ
رَبُّكُمْ وَعَدًّا حَسَنًا أَفَطَالَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْعَهْدُ أَمْ أَرَدْتُمْ أَنْ يَحِلَّ

عَلَيْكُمْ غَضَبٌ مِنْ رَبِّكُمْ فَأَخْلَقْتُمْ مَوْعِدِي ۖ قَالُوا مَا

أَخْلَقْنَا مَوْعِدَكَ بِمَلَكِنَا وَلَكِنَّا حَمَلْنَا أَوْزَارًا مِنْ زِينَةِ الْقَوْمِ

فَقَدَفْنَاهَا فَكَذَلِكَ أَتَى السَّامِرِيُّ ۖ (طه: ٨٦-٨٧)

These verses narrate the speech that Moses talked with his people. It can be considered as blame because of their wrong doing with Samiri.

In the first verse, the reader can notice two promises, the promise of Allah:

أَلَمْ يَعِدْكُمْ رَبُّكُمْ وَعَدًّا حَسَنًا

أَتَاهَا تَسْعَى ۝ فَأَوْحَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةَ مُوسَى ۝

(طه: ٦٥-٦٧)

These verses begin with a question from the Egyptians asking Moses about who would be the first participant to begin the race.

إِنَّمَا أَنْ تَلْقَىٰ وَإِنَّمَا أَنْ نَكُونَ أَوْلَ مَنْ أَلْقَىٰ

Moses answered them positively relying that they could be the first. They threw their ropes and rods and seemed to move about them like snakes. So, it is Question / Answer with unmarked preferred second turn.

قَالَ آمَنْتُمْ لَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ آذَنَ لَكُمْ إِنَّهُ لَكَبِيرِكُمْ الَّذِي عَلَّمَكُمُ
السِّحْرَ فَلَا قَطْعَ أَيْدِيكُمْ وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ مِنْ خِلَافٍ وَلَا صَلْبِنَكُمْ
فِي جُذُوعِ النَّخْلِ وَلَتَعْلَمُنَّ أَيُّنَا أَشَدُّ عَذَابًا وَأَبْقَىٰ ۝ قَالُوا لَنْ
نُؤْتِرَكَ عَلَىٰ مَا جَاءَنَا مِنَ الْبَيْتَاتِ وَالَّذِي فَطَرَنَا فَاقْضِ مَا
أَنْتَ قَاضٍ إِنَّمَا تَقْضِي هَذِهِ الْحَيَاةَ الدُّنْيَا ۝ (طه: ٧١-٧٢)

In these verses, when Moses and Aaron produced all their miracles before the Egyptians, the magicians of Egypt believed in Moses all the time, in turn, Pharaoh accused his sorcerers who had been converted, of having been in league with Moses all the time, and in fact in having been led and taught by him. So arrogance and evil cannot conceive of Allah's worlds and worlds of beauty and truth beyond its own narrow vision. It is truly blind, and its very cleverness

deludes it to wander far from the truth.

As such, the magicians refused to return to Pharaoh because of the miracles Moses produced; they represent the personality of the messengers of Allah, and the logic of events as they unfolded themselves, and the light of the inner conviction in their own conscience.

According to the analysis of these adjacency pairs, it is a conversation between Pharaoh (the first participant), and the magicians (his sorcerers) (the second participant) . It begins with a rhetorical question which does not need an answer, it is just like blame:-

آمَنْتُمْ لَهُ قَبْلَ أَنْ آذَنَ لَكُمْ إِنَّهُ لَكَبِيرِكُمْ الَّذِي عَلَّمَكُمُ السِّحْرَ

In the same verse, this blame is followed by an assessment, instead of denial, or accepting it, so it is an insertion sequences in the form of a statement following that blame:

فَلَا قَطْعَ أَيْدِيكُمْ وَأَرْجُلِكُمْ مِنْ خِلَافٍ وَلَا صَلْبِنَكُمْ فِي

جُذُوعِ النَّخْلِ وَلَتَعْلَمُنَّ أَيُّنَا أَشَدُّ عَذَابًا وَأَبْقَىٰ

This assessment is followed by an acceptance in which the magicians accepted Pharaoh's sentence insisting on their belief and what accompanied it.

قَالُوا لَنْ نُؤْتِرَكَ عَلَىٰ مَا جَاءَنَا مِنَ الْبَيْتَاتِ وَالَّذِي فَطَرَنَا

فَاقْضِ مَا أَنْتَ قَاضٍ إِنَّمَا تَقْضِي هَذِهِ الْحَيَاةَ الدُّنْيَا

قَالَ رَبُّنَا الَّذِي أَعْطَى كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهُ ثُمَّ هَدَى ۝ قَالَ فَمَا
بِالْقُرُونِ الْأُولَى ۝ قَالَ عَلِمَهَا عِنْدَ رَبِّي فِي كِتَابٍ لَا يَضِلُّ
رَبِّي وَلَا يَنْسَى ۝ (طه: ٥٠-٥٢)

Pharaoh asked them that question to trap Moses into scathing denunciations of his ancestors, which would at once have deprived him of the sympathy or the hearing of the Egyptian crowd. In that position, Moses could not answer him directly, instead, he remembered the injunction given to him to speak mildly, but did not in any way whittle down the truth, but he said in effect :

قَالَ عَلِمَهَا عِنْدَ رَبِّي فِي كِتَابٍ لَا يَضِلُّ رَّبِّي وَلَا يَنْسَى

Thus, it is an adjacency pair of Question / Answer, as a result, it is preferred second turn and unmarked.

وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا آيَاتِنَا كُلَّهَا فَكَذَّبَ وَأَبَى ۝ قَالَ أَجِئْتَنَا لِتُخْرِجَنَا
مِنْ أَرْضِنَا بِسِحْرِكَ يَا مُوسَى ۝ فَلَمَّا تَبَيَّنَ بِسِحْرِهِ مِثْلَهُ
فَأَجْعَلْ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكَ مَوْعِدًا لَا نُخْلَفُهُ نَحْنُ وَلَا أَنْتَ مَكَانًا
سَوِيًّا ۝ قَالَ مَوْعِدُكُمْ يَوْمَ الزَّيْتَةِ وَأَنْ يُحْشَرَ النَّاسُ ضُحًى ۝
(طه: ٥٦-٥٩)

This is a sort of general introduction to the confrontation between Moses and Pharaoh. The signs of Moses were not only the

countering of the fraudulent magic of Egypt with real miracles. The Egyptians accused Moses of a design to deprive them of their land, and of exercising black magic. They decided to make a meeting in a place where both sides would have even chances. Their meeting would be on the great day of a Temple Festival. Moses made this appointment in order to collect as large a number as possible, for his first duty was to preach the Truth.

Concerning conversation analysis, the conversation begins with a request from the Egyptians (the first participant):

فَأَجْعَلْ بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكَ مَوْعِدًا لَا نُخْلَفُهُ نَحْنُ وَلَا أَنْتَ مَكَانًا

سَوِيًّا

According to this, it is in need for an acceptance or a refusal to make a pair, so, Moses (the second participant) accepted that request positively:

قَالَ مَوْعِدُكُمْ يَوْمَ الزَّيْتَةِ وَأَنْ يُحْشَرَ النَّاسُ

positively: ضُحًى to make a preferred second turn of Request / Acceptance. It is unmarked.

قَالُوا يَا مُوسَى إِمَّا أَنْ تُلْقِيَ وَإِمَّا أَنْ نَكُونَ أَوْلَ مَنْ أَلْقَى ۝

قَالَ بَلِ الْقَوْمُ فَيَا إِذَا حَبَّالَهُمْ وَعَصِيهِمْ يُخِيلُ إِلَيْهِ مِنْ سِحْرِهِمْ

فَأْتِيَاهُ فَقُولَا إِنَّا رَسُولَا رَبِّكَ فَأَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَلَا
تَعَذِّبْهُمْ قَدْ جِئْنَاكَ بَيِّنَاتٍ مِّن رَّبِّكَ وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيَّ مَنِ اتَّبَعَ
الْهُدَىٰ ۝ إِنَّا قَدْ أُوحِيَ إِلَيْنَا أَنَّ الْعَذَابَ عَلَىٰ مَن كَذَّبَ
وَتَوَلَّىٰ ۝ قَالَ فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمَا يَا مُوسَىٰ ۝ قَالَ رَبُّنَا الَّذِي أَعْطَىٰ
كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهُ ثُمَّ هَدَىٰ ۝ (طه: ٤٧-٥٠)

These verses talk about the meeting between Moses and Aaron (the first participant), and Pharaoh, (the second participant). The children of Israel were subjected to all sorts of oppression and indignities. They were given hard tasks: their leaders were unjustly beaten; they were forced to make bricks without straw.

Allah, in His indefinite Mercy, always offers peace to the most hardened sinners, even those who are warring against Him. The punishment must inevitably come for sin, whether the sinner is great or small. Pharaoh rejected the implication of Moses's speech, and he repudiated the suggestion that the Allah who had sent Moses and Aaron could possibly be Pharaoh's Lord. He asked insolently.

قَالَ فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمَا يَا مُوسَىٰ

The answer of Moses is straight forward, dignified, and illuminating. He and his brother

were proud to serve Allah (ربنا), but He was the One and the only God who had created all beings and all things:

قَالَ رَبُّنَا الَّذِي أَعْطَىٰ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهُ ثُمَّ هَدَىٰ

As has been said before, these verses can be considered as the starting conversation with Pharaoh. It is started with a statement from Moses and Aaron saying:

إِنَّا رَسُولَا رَبِّكَ

and it is said to justify their commission, and directly it is followed by an order and prohibition:

فَأَرْسِلْ مَعَنَا بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ وَلَا تَعَذِّبْهُمْ

Accordingly, it is the first turn in the form of order, what is expected is to be followed by an acceptance or a refusal, but instead, it is followed by a question from Pharaoh to make an insertion sequence:

قَالَ فَمَنْ رَبُّكُمَا يَا مُوسَىٰ

In turn, Moses answered his question positively to make the preferred second turn of Question / answer which is unmarked:

اذْهَبْ إِلَى فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَى ۖ قَالَ رَبِّ اشْرَحْ لِي صَدْرِي ۖ
وَسِّرْ لِي أَمْرِي ۖ وَاجْعَلْ لِي وَزِيرًا مِنْ أَهْلِي ۖ هَارُونَ أَخِي ۖ اشْدُدْ بِهِ
أُزْرِي ۖ وَأَشْرِكْهُ فِي أَمْرِي ۖ كَيْ نَسْتَبِيحَكَ كَبِيرًا ۖ وَتَذَكُرَكْ
كَبِيرًا ۖ إِنَّكَ كُنْتَ بِنَا بَصِيرًا ۖ قَالَ قَدْ أُوتِيتَ سُؤْلَكَ يَا
مُوسَى ۖ

(طه: ٢٤-٣٦)

Moses, having been spiritually prepared now, gets his definite commission to go to Pharaoh and point out the errors of his ways. Allah ordered Moses to go to Pharaoh. There are three things Moses also asked for. He asked for Allah's help in his task, which at first appears difficult to him, the gift of eloquence, and the removal of the impediment from his speech and the counsel and constant attendance with him of his brother Aaron, whom he loved and trusted. The requests that Moses made are inspired, not by earthly but by spiritual motives. The motive, expressed in the most general terms, is to glorify Allah, not in an occasional way, but systematically and continuously. The clauses in this verse and the next, taken together, govern all the requests he made. The verses begin with an

order from Allah to Moses in the form of imperative:

اذْهَبْ إِلَى فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَى

Instead of accepting that order directly, Moses asked Allah the above requests, so, it is an insertion sequence, but at last, Allah accepted all his requests:

قَالَ قَدْ أُوتِيتَ سُؤْلَكَ يَا مُوسَى

In turn, Moses accepted that commission. As a result, it is Order, request / Acceptance.

اذْهَبَا إِلَى فِرْعَوْنَ إِنَّهُ طَغَى ۖ فَقُولَا لَهُ قَوْلًا لَيْنًا لَعَلَّهُ يَتَذَكَّرُ
أَوْ يَخْشَى ۖ قَالَ رَبَّنَا إِنَّا نَخَافُ أَنْ يُفْرِطَ عَلَيْنَا أَوْ أَنْ
يَطْغَى ۖ قَالَ لَا تَخَافَا إِنِّي مَعَكُمَا أَسْمَعُ وَأَرَى ۖ

(طه: ٤٣-٤٦)

Their mission was in the first instance to Pharaoh and to the Egyptians, and then to lead Israel out of Egypt. These verses represent the actual conversation between Allah and Moses when He ordered them to go to Pharaoh and try to speak to him mildly. Again, there is a statement (insertion) sequence:

إِنَّا نَخَافُ أَنْ يُفْرِطَ عَلَيْنَا أَوْ أَنْ يَطْغَى

between the order and its acceptance. As a whole, it is a preferred second turn of Order, request / Acceptance. It is unmarked.

preferred second turn of Order / Acceptance type, it is unmarked.

وَمَا تِلْكَ بِيَمِينِكَ يَا مُوسَى ۖ قَالَ هِيَ عَصَايَ أَتَوَكَّأُ عَلَيْهَا
وَأَهْشَأُ بِهَا عَلَىٰ غَنَمِي وَلِيَ فِيهَا مَآرِبُ أُخْرَىٰ ۖ

(طه: ١٧-١٨)

These verses narrate the miracle of his rod. First of all, the attention of Moses himself is drawn to it, and he thinks of the ordinary uses to which he puts in his daily life.

The conversation begins by a question from Allah to Moses about his rod, and in turn, he answered positively. Accordingly, it is a preferred second turn of Question / Answer in which Allah (first participant) is the questioner and Moses (second participant) who answers the question. It is unmarked.

قَالَ اللَّهُ يَا مُوسَىٰ ۖ فَالْقَاهَا فَإِذَا هِيَ حَيَّةٌ تَسْعَىٰ ۖ

(طه: ١٩-٢٠)

Here begins the miracle of his rod. Allah ordered him to throw it, Moses threw it and it appeared before him as a long and creeping, writhing serpent. Here, there is a symbol to present Allah's mystery to Moses' mind and understanding : the rod becomes alive snake , and

its active motion is what is most to be impressed on the mind of Moses .

The verses begin with an order from Allah to Moses to throw his own rod. In turn, Moses threw it doing what Allah ordered him. As such, it is a preferred second turn of Order / Acceptance, it is unmarked.

قَالَ خُذْهَا وَلَا تَخَفْ سَتُعِيدُهَا سِيرَتَهَا الْأُولَىٰ ۖ وَاضْمُمْ
يَدَكَ إِلَىٰ جَنَاحِكَ تَخْرُجَ بَيْضَاءَ مِنْ غَيْرِ سُوءٍ آيَةٌ أُخْرَىٰ ۖ
لِنُرِيكَ مِنْ آيَاتِنَا الْكُبْرَىٰ ۖ

(طه: ٢١-٢٣)

Another order from Allah to Moses to take his rod, positively, it is a preferred second turn of Order / Acceptance since Moses seized his rod, this action is accomplished non-vocally. It is unmarked.

The second miracle is the one of his hand. Ordinarily, when the skin becomes white, it is a sign of disease, leprosy or something loathsome. Here there was no question of disease: on the contrary, the hand was glorified, and it shone as with a divine light. Such a miracle was beyond a human magic. Accordingly, it is a preferred second turn of Order / Acceptance, but his acceptance was non-vocally, by moving his hand. It is unmarked.

example of insertion sequence. It also represents a distance between what is expected and what is provided.

3. Analysis

The practical part of this research is devoted to analyzing Taha Sura by referring to the types of adjacency pairs. The purpose behind this choice is to shed light on the various types of such pairs adopted in this sura.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 وَهَلْ أَتَاكَ حَدِيثُ مُوسَى ۖ إِذْ رَأَى نَارًا فَقَالَ لِأَهْلِهِ امْكُثُوا
 إِنِّي آنَسْتُ نَارًا لَعَلِّي آتِيكُم مِّنْهَا بِخَبَرٍ أَوْ بَصُورٍ ۚ لَئِن لَّمْ يَهِدِ
 اللَّهُ سُبُلَ النَّاسِ لَمَ يَذُوبُوا ۗ أَلَيْسَ إِنَّكَ بِرَحِيمٍ ۚ (طه: ١١-١٢)

These two verses narrate the story of Moses in its different incidents. It is told in many places in the Holy Quran, and in each case, the phase most appropriate in the context is referred to or emphasized; it is a phase from the religious history of mankind.

These verses are a conversation between Moses and his wife (أهله) when he saw a fire in the distance. It appeared like an ordinary fire, which always betokens the presence of men in a desert or a lonely place. Moses made for it alone, to fetch wherewithal for making a fire for his family, and perhaps to find some

direction as to the way, from the people he should meet there.

The conversation begins by the first participant (Moses) to the second participant (his wife) when he ordered them to stay there (أمكثوا) in the form of imperative. In turn, they accepted non-vocally to stay that they stayed there. Thus, it is a preferred second turn of Order /Acceptance type. Accordingly, it is unmarked.

فَلَمَّا أَتَاهَا نُودِيَ يَا مُوسَى ۖ أَنِ إِنِّي أَنَا رَبُّكَ فَاخْلَعْ نَعْلَيْكَ إِنَّكَ
 بِالْوَادِ الْمُقَدَّسِ طُوًى ۚ (طه: ١١-١٢)

When (Moses) went to see the fire, it was not an ordinary fire, it was a Burning Bush: a Sign of the Glory of Allah. The spiritual history of Moses begins here. It was his spiritual birth; infancy and upbringing are referred to later on.

Here, another participant appeared who is the sound from Heaven, from above. He will be the Commander for Moses later on. He begins the conversation by calling on Moses ordering him to put off his slippers:

إِنِّي أَنَا رَبُّكَ فَاخْلَعْ نَعْلَيْكَ إِنَّكَ بِالْوَادِ الْمُقَدَّسِ طُوًى

Moses, in turn, put off his shoes as a mark of respect, so, he accepted. In conclusion, it is a

pairs together " Like Stubbs (1983: 111) , for him , preferred second parts tend to be structurally simpler , allowing quicker and easier proposal while the dispreferred ones tend to be structurally complex .

Levinson (1983:322-6) draws preferred and dispreferred second turns in that the former is the unmarked turn, whereas the latter is the marked.

Below is a diagramm of marked and unmarked adjacency pairs according to Levinson (1983).

disagreement which is called dispreferred action turn shape. The rationale behind preference organization is that there are differences in the design of adjacency pairs, i.e, it can be accepted or refused, assesment can be agreed with or disagreed with, and requests can be granted or denied between positive and negative alternatives.

Nofsinger (1991:64) notes that " ... *it is the expectation of the second pair part – conditional relevance rather than the actual adjacency that binds the adjacency*

First Turn					
	Request	Offer / Invite	Assessment	Question	Blame
Second Turn					
Preferred	Acceptance	Acceptance	Agreement	Expected answer	Denial
Dispreferred	Refusal	Refusal	Disagreement	Unexpected Answer or Non/answer	Admission

There is a further dimension in the sequences which form part of adjacency pairs. As a result, it sometimes happens that the adjacency pair structure can be disrupted by an insertion sequence. It is a piece of conversational activity with its own structure (Mc Carthy, 1991:122). Yule (1996:78) gives a simple definition for the insertion sequence as "*it is one adjacency pair within another*".

For demonstration, although the expressions used may be question – answer sequences, other forms of social actions are also accomplished within this pattern. For example, making a question between the pair request-acceptance seems to function as a condition on the acceptance being provided.

However, Shiffrin (1987:3) regards the pause and the delay to answer or communicate is an

the adjacency pairs format is that they provide a normative framework by which next actions are understood.

In conclusion, adjacency pairs system is one of the fundamental units of conversation and structure.

2.2. Preference System

Sometimes the notion of adjacency pairs follows the criteria that given a first part of the pair, a second part is immediately relevant and expectable. If such a second fails to occur, it is noticeably absent, and if some other first part occurs in its place and that will be heard where possible as some preliminary to the doing of the second part, the relevance of which is not lifted until it is directly attended to or aborted by the announced failure to provide some preliminary action. Yule (1996:79) holds that adjacency pairs display certain agreement between the participants, for demonstration, accepting a request is structurally more likely than a refusal, this is called preference system. It classified second parts into preferred and dispreferred social acts.

Pomerantz (1984:33) defines preference system in conversational analysis terms as the formate for agreement which is labeled as the preferred action turn shape and

Renkema (1993: 112) describes this system as having a conditional relationship to the sequences of a conversation, i.e., one utterance has a role in determining the subsequent utterances or at least in raising expectations concerning its contents. Stenstrom (1994: 2) assures that the pairs occur for different actions. These include not only request for information, but also greeting, (Hi, Hi), farewells (Bye, Bye), offers, (Have some cakes, Thanks), orders (sit down, yes - sir), and apologies (Sorry, oh, that is okay). They are used for even the simplest exchanges of information (I've got a job Have you?).

In conversation, adjacency nextness, (Schegloff, 1968: 184) plays a central role in sequential organization. Next turns, for example, are strategic position in which parties to talk - in-interaction may react to what another has said or done.

Moreover, Renkema (1993: 243) regards adjacency as two subsequent utterances constituting a conversational exchange. Each sentence of the pair is characterized by its type of illocutionary intention. The first part is a summon, and the second is a reaction to that summon. Heritage (1984: 22) holds that one impact of

require greetings , and so on .

In fact, Levinson(1983: 309) puts a rule governing the use of adjacency pairs, namely:

Having produced a first part of some pair, current speaker must stop talking , and next speaker must produce at that part a second part to the same pair

Coulthard (1985 : 69) assures that there is a class of first pair parts which includes questions , greeting , offers , requests , complaints , invitations , an assessment , for some first pair parts , the scnd pair part is the same (greeting – greeting) , for same , there is only appropriate second (question – answer) , for some , more than one (complaints , progody justification) .

Schegloff and Sacks (1973: 289) describe the adjacency pairs as having two parts, the first part is a proposal, and the second is the uptake of that proposal. This means that they are produced by different speakers and the occurrence of the second part is a condition to the first part.

terms of taking and giving turns to each other (ibid .:44) .

According to Crystal(1985: 7)sociolinguistically, adjacency pairs system is a term used in analyzing conversational interactions to refer to a single stimulus – plus- response used by the participants. They have been analyzed in terms of their role in initiating, maintaining and closing conversation (e.g., the various conventions of greeting, leave – taking, topic – change), it has been suggested as an important methodological concept in investigating the ethnography of communication .

Levinson (1983: 303) considers adjacency pairs system as one local management organization in conversation. He presents a simple definition for this system as "*sequences of two utterances*" which have the following characteristics:

- (i) adjacent
- (ii) produced by different speakers
- (iii) ordered , as a first part and a second part
- (iv) typed, so that a particular first part requires a particular second ,e.g., offers require acceptance or rejection , greetings

pairs are important because they "steer us" towards a good understanding of a given answer, the question is relevant. Nonetheless, conversation is much more just combining pairs in sequences. Adjacency is a case of coherent sequencing, but not all sequencing needs to be defined strictly in terms of adjacency.

Coulthard (1985:70) considers the adjacency pairs the basic structural units in conversation. They are used for opening and closing conversation.

The current speaker can select which participant will speak next, either by naming him or by alluding to him with a descriptive phrase. If the current speaker selects the next speaker; he usually also selects the type of the next utterance by producing the first part of an adjacency pair, for example, a question which constrains the selected speaker to produce an appropriate answer (ibid.: 60).

Usually, a person uses a greeting and introduce himself/herself when he/she begins a conversation with another one. This is the key to study this system in English.

Moves in a conversation are made up of acts and moves themselves occupied the structure of exchanges. In this account, the structure of moves is described in

virtue of our prior understanding of what is involved in the performance of illocutionary acts; and that we acquire this understanding, just as we acquire our understanding of how deixis operates, by engaging in communicative acts and learning how particular language –system conventionalizes the means of referring to ourselves, our addressees and other components of the situation of utterance.

One of the most outstanding components of conversation is its organization of adjacency pairs and the preference system. The present research is devoted to making an account of this system.

2. Adjacency and Preference Systems

2.1. Adjacency Pairs System

Adjacency is usually defined as having to do with the illocutionary character (type) of the adjacency pair. However, for discourse to be coherent, it is not enough, or even necessary that an utterance and its predecessor or successor, combined into an adjacency pair abide by the strict rules formulated by the conversation analysts and based on an orthodox speech act interpretation of the utterances in question (Mey, 1990: 248).

(May : 249) agrees with Levinson (1983) admitting that

Adjacency Pairs in Taha Sura: A Linguistic Analysis

By

Jenan Atiya Muftin
Assistant Lecturer

Abstract

In any conversation, many utterances are produced to be related to each other to make one coherent unit. Many utterances are directed at eliciting particular responses. For example, confrontations generally require apologies, counter – complaints or denial of responsibility. Such natural two-part system called is adjacency pair.

Adjacency pairs system can be considered so fundamental in organizing conversation that this system tries to analyze its turns and their effect grammatically, pragmatically, and in discourse analysis. In addition, this system cannot be separated from preference system since the latter is concerned with the illuccionary force of the turns (pairs).

This study has two parts; the first is the theoretical which deals with the concept of adjacency pairs system, its definition, and its parts etc. The second is the practical which is devoted to analyzing a religious text taken from the Glorious Quran - Taha Sura with a complete analysis of its verses concerning this system . This choice is because of this sura's richness with the most common kinds of that system. It aims to find out the most outstanding characteristics of adjacency pairs system and what is related like to it like preference system and non-vocal elements operated in this sura.

the lives and interests of the interlocutors themselves. In addition, the interlocutors share the same physical and temporal context and often share extensive personal background knowledge.

Lyons (1970:780) assimilates the performative function of verbs of saying to their descriptive function, rather than to assume that we come to know the sense and denotation of verbs of saying by

1. Introduction

Conversation is one type of registers in English. It is grammatically characterized by a frequent use of the first person pronouns. Conversation is spoken, directly interactive, and arguably the most basic form of human communication. Although conversational partners can have a range of communicative purposes, the topics usually involve a focus on